



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

that, on the whole, the "Cours de Mineralogie" is better adapted to the wants of the well-rounded mineralogist than any other single book published. A table showing the relations between the crystallographic symbols of Lévy, Miller, Naumann and Dana, and an index of thirty-five pages, complete the volume. Before concluding this notice, it should be mentioned that the author finds no existing method of mineral classification satisfactory to himself. He divides the minerals into four groups, as follows: 1, the elements of rocks; 2, the elements of mineral deposits; 3, metallic minerals, and 4, combustible minerals; and uses this classification as the basis of the *systematic* portion of his book.

**Lévy's Structures et Classification des Roches Eruptives.**—Lévy's small volume<sup>2</sup> on the classification and structure of rocks is so entirely argumentative that no satisfactory analysis of it can be given in these pages. It is directed against Professor Rosenbusch's classification. Many instances are cited to show that the principles of this latter classification, when pushed to their legitimate consequences, must lead to the grouping together of rocks that have little similarity to each other, while, on the other hand, many that are evidently closely connected genetically must be widely separated in different groups. Lévy calls for a purely petrographical classification of rocks, independent of geological considerations. The author's cause would have appeared much stronger had his arguments been less sprinkled with claims to priority over Rosenbusch in the proposal of terms descriptive of rock structure. The book merits close study as an appeal to petrographers to cut loose from theoretical considerations, and to make their classifications, for the present at least, expressions of observed facts.

**Thomas's Ohio Mounds.**<sup>3</sup>—In these two papers Dr. Thomas continues to maintain his thesis, already noted in our pages, that the earthworks of Ohio were built by the ancestors of the Red Indians of historic time. In the second of the two papers, the Cherokees are shown to have been mound-builders since the advent of the whites; and our author tries to trace them northward, connecting them with the monuments in West Virginia (near Charleston), and also with the traditional Tallegwi. To this end the Walum olam is invoked to show

<sup>2</sup> M. Lévy; Structures et Classification des Roches Eruptives. 95 pp. Paris, 1889.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas, Cyrus: The Circular, Square and Octagonal Earthworks, of Ohio. Pp. 33 +iii. The Problems of the Ohio Mounds. Pp. 33 +ii. Washington Bureau of Ethnology, 1889.

that the Tallegwi formerly occupied Ohio, and were thence driven south by Huron-Iroquois and Lenapé. (We wish this bark record did not depend on Rafinesque for its authenticity.) While willing to agree with Dr. Thomas that the Cherokees have been mound-builders, we are not ready to admit that he has proved that they were the sole mound-builders, nor that he has connected them beyond a doubt with the Tallegwi, although we admit that there is a syllabic, rhythmic and vocal correspondence between the latter and the name Chellakee. In the second paper Thomas points out some of the errors of measurement in regard to the surveys of Squier and Davis' great work, besides giving accurate surveys made by the Bureau of Ethnology. "Accurate surveys," by the way, are rather amusing concoctions. We have seen a compilation of "accurate surveys" of the great Serpent Mound, the largest of which was nearly double the smallest, while two made the same week, varied about two hundred feet.

**Pilling's Bibliographies.**<sup>1</sup>—In these, as in the previously-issued Eskimo and Siouan lists, the Bureau of Ethnology has made a valuable contribution, not only for the student of American linguistics, but for those in other lines of American anthropology. The evident care bestowed upon them, the references to libraries where copies of the rarer works may be found, and the abundant bibliographical notes, make the series indispensable for all who wish to *know* something of the American Indian. To review such works is impossible; to point out omissions, or typographical errors, is but cheap criticism, but to call attention of those interested to the existence of such works is to do them a favor.

<sup>1</sup> Pilling, J. C.: *Bibliography of the Muskogean Languages*. Pp. 114. *Bibliography of the Iroquoian Languages*. Pp. 208. Bureau of Ethnology: Washington, 1889.